

The Highland Building Study Group
Possible Dispositions and Use of
The Highland Building
August 8, 2008

Study Group Members:

Alan Carpenito
John Ballantine
Bob Hilton
Ken Hoffman
Dale Ryder
Bob Stone
Wendell Sykes (partial)

Table of Contents

- a. Executive Summary with Conclusions.
- b. Main Report:
 - i. Our Charge and Our Interpretation.
 - ii. How We Interpreted the Charge.
 - iii. Discussions.
 - iv. Cost Study.
- c. Final Observations.
- d. List of Exhibits.

Executive Summary with Conclusions:

Introduction:

The Highland Building was constructed one hundred years ago. It is a fine example of turn of the century architecture – it resembles in age and design the Gleason Public Library, the only other historical public building of its kind in Carlisle. However, unlike the Gleason Public Library, the Highland Building has not been maintained and is in need of renovation and repair. Until the mid 1970's, the Highland Building was used by the school for classrooms. Since that time, the building has been leased to various tenants but is, at present, vacant. In its current state, the Highland Building represents a liability to the school and to the community. If a decision is not made about the future of the building, it will, by default, fall into such a state of disrepair that the only option might be to tear it down.

At a School Committee meeting in the fall of 2007, at which the School Building Committee was present, members of the School Committee voted that the Highland Building was no longer appropriate for school use¹. In addition, a new school building design proposed other uses for the land upon which the Highland Building sits. An impasse about what to do with the building and the land on which the building is situated, had been reached. It was at this point, that the Selectmen appointed the Highland Building Study Group and tasked the members to explore all options regarding the fate of the building – the costs of moving the building, demolishing the building and the costs associated with repairing and renovating the building. The Highland Study Group, comprised of Alan Carpenito, Ken Hoffman, John Ballantine, Bob Hilton, Dale Ryder, and Bob Stone (Wendell Sykes served for two months) have spent the past five months examining and weighing all these options and are now prepared to make a recommendation to the Selectmen. This recommendation is based on new information regarding the use of CPA funds for restoration as well as professional cost estimates of each of the disposition options. The following report outlines each of the options, details the costs associated with each and makes a formal recommendation as to what should be done with the building.

Conclusions:

First Conclusion:

The Highland Building has substantial practical value as well as historic and architectural value to the Town of Carlisle. That "value" is increased by the considerable "demand" for space from various segments of the town government and various non-profit town programs. This demand increases, or maybe even creates the "real value" of the building,

¹ This was the Carlisle School Committee's position in 2007. At the time of this report that is no longer their position.

because it could be said that the building's value only exists if "someone wants it". The report and analysis that follows recommends that the Highland Building be stabilized, restored and renovated for a "to-be-determined" use where it presently stands.

The Study Group believes The Highland Building has a place in Carlisle's future providing economical, flexible and attractive space, whether for Carlisle Public School use, other public uses or some combination of both.

Second Conclusion:

All Carlisle citizens must, after reviewing the issues, options and costs, have the opportunity to vote on ultimate disposition of the Highland Building.

Given the existing value of the Highland School Building, we recommend and urge the Town to act immediately to preserve the building. The process of deciding how to best use the building, and to put those plans into effect will take time... and that time could destroy the "value" (if the building deteriorates) if we do not act to preserve it.

Third Conclusion:

The entire Highland Building cannot be properly and effectively adapted to the programming needs of the Carlisle Public Schools. Thus, if the disposition of the Highland is left to the Carlisle School Committee, their only logical decision would be to demolish it because the School Committee would not find a financially sound school use for the building. However, our study finds that there are combinations of school and other public uses that are feasible and that there may also be some fully non-school uses that are feasible.

Thus, the burden of the decision, the upkeep and the execution of a plan to reuse the Highland must be lifted from the School Committee. The Carlisle Board of Selectmen must take control of the building and must assure the CSC that they will be closely consulted throughout the process of creating and executing a plan for the Highland's use. The Highland is physically intertwined with the school campus and the Carlisle Board of Selectmen must assure the CSC that the school will have a REAL say in the outcome.

Recommendation:

Because the new School Building Project planning process is already underway and since the Highland itself has some current exposure to the elements, time is of the essence. The Highland Building Study Group recommends the following action steps and time frames:

1. The Carlisle Board of Selectmen takes control of the Highland as soon as possible.

2. A plan that presents a logical thoughtful process justifying the expenditure of CPA funds² to stabilize the Highland is immediately prepared and presented to the Town Meeting.³
3. Immediately following item #2 above, a repair RFP (estimated cost \$409,000) is created, issued and awarded for stabilization of the Highland Building. Concurrently, a Highland Building Committee, in parallel with the School Building Committee, would begin an in depth study of all the possible adaptive re-uses of the building as presented in this report.
4. Repairs are completed to stabilize the building by October 2009, if not earlier.
5. Adaptive re-use options studies for the stabilized Highland Building are presented to the Town of final determination of use.

² Estimated at \$409,000.

³ If the Town determines the Highland has “value”, then we proceed to step 3. If the Town decides stabilizing and adaptive re-use of the Highland is not warranted then the building would remain “as is” and its fate would be determined by the School Building Project process.

Main Report:

1) Our charge and our interpretation:

- a) The Highland Building Study Group was created by the Selectmen to “Study and Report Back on the Possible Uses and Ultimate Disposition of the Highland Building”⁴. The Selectmen’s charge had three parts:
 - i) Develop possible dispositions of the Highland Building.
 - ii) Research possible user groups for the Highland Building.
 - iii) Study the feasibility and practicality of items 1 and 2 above.
- b) How we interpreted the charge: The Selectmen’s charge to the Highland Building Study Group was interpreted to be composed of three parts. The three parts were:
 - i) The Highland Building Study Group was instructed to conduct a thorough study of all possible dispositions of the Highland Building. The possible dispositions listed by the Selectmen were:
 - (1) On site preservation.
 - (2) Moving.
 - (3) Sale to other party.
 - (4) Demolition.
 - ii) The Highland Building Study Group was also instructed to investigate possible user groups. The possible user groups provided by the Selectmen were:
 - (1) Carlisle Public School.
 - (2) Other town departments.
 - (3) Private associations.
 - (4) Non-profits.
 - (5) Institutional organizations.
 - iii) After the Highland Building Study Group completed tasks 1 and 2 above, our report was to combine them into a study of the feasibility, costs, practicality, historical ramifications and “does the concept make sense”.

2) Discussion:

- a) The first several meetings of the Highland Building Study Group were spent understanding the Highland Building history.
 - i) Dave Flannery, as a citizen of Carlisle, provided documentation of the Highland Building history.
 - (1) Dave provided us with floor plans of the Highland Building.⁵
 - (2) Dave provided us with his personal history collection of the Highland Building entitled “Highland Building 1908-2008”.⁶
 - (3) Dave Flannery, Fire Chief, explained the concerns he would have regarding fire dept access around the building if the Highland was enlarged as well as existing concerns with the wood structure in a fire and the current lack of a fire alarm system.

⁴ See Exhibit A

⁵ See Exhibit B.

⁶ See Exhibit D.

- b) We toured the building to understand the existing condition of the building. We listened to Dave Flannery in his role as Supervisor Building and Grounds, Carlisle Public School, explain how he currently maintains the Highland Building. We listened to his concerns regarding the current Highland Building condition.
- c) Through the Carlisle Mosquito, we researched all the previous articles written to understand the history of the Highland Building and previous discussions, votes, official positions and opinions directed towards the Highland Building.
- d) We obtained and read the HMFH School Campus Master plan of 2005 and developed an understanding of how HMFH viewed the Highland Building.
 - i) We extracted all the HMFH comments regarding the Highland Building and created a summary document for our use.⁷
 - ii) The Highland Building was considered unsuitable for school use by the HMFH report. Their assumption at the time was that funds diverted to renovate the Highland Building would be better used to build new school space.
- e) We listened to Bill Risso, representing the School Building Committee, as he explained the School Master Plan and how the Highland Building is viewed in their current campus master plan.
 - i) Bill provided us with HMFH's November 2005 programming study for the Carlisle Public School so that we could better understand the square footage requirements for the Carlisle Public School to see how well they would adapt to the Highland Building.⁸
 - ii) Bill also explained how the SBC sees the future development of the campus. Presently and in the short term, the Highland Building does present a problem for the campus (parking, traffic flow, logistics, etc.). However, in the long term, as the campus replaces the aging single story energy-inefficient structures with more condensed multi-floored educational structures, the Highland Building would be more isolated from the campus center and have significantly less impact on the campus.
- f) John Ballantine presented us with the results of a 1990 Opinion Survey of the possible uses of the Highland Building that showed a desire to preserve the building.⁹
- g) We met and discussed the Highland issue with representatives of the Carlisle School Committee. We believe the following best describes their approach to the Highland Building:

⁷ See Exhibit K.

⁸ See Exhibit C.

⁹ See Exhibit E.

- i) The CSC is concerned that restoration of the Highland Building for school use would not be reimbursed by the state and therefore it would be too expensive to renovate it for school use.
 - ii) The CSC was concerned about Highland Building security and the wood structure as a fire hazard.
 - iii) The CSC was concerned that all the necessary upgrades to the building would alter the appearance of the building and it would no longer be the Highland Building that everyone loves.
 - iv) The CSC is willing to allow the Carlisle School Building committee to study the possible integration of the Highland into the new School building project. The study would involve programmed use studies as well as “cost to renovate for school use” premiums, if applicable. The information from that study would allow the citizens of Carlisle to make a decision regarding the Highlands use as a school facility.
- h) We prepared written questions for Marie Doyle, Super of Schools.¹⁰ These questions were submitted to the School Committee who, after review, obtained the responses from Ms. Doyle. The purpose of the questions was to obtain the opinions of the professional educator responsible for the safety of the campus, security of the campus, education of the students and the quality of life for the education staff on the campus. Ms. Doyle’s responses were incorporated into the Option Pros/Cons portion of this report¹¹ and summarized here:
- i) She is concerned that the building is vacant and continues to deteriorate.
 - ii) She would like to see the building restored to its original majestic state but is concerned that any funds diverted to restore and maintain Highland would have to come from educational funds.
 - iii) She was pleased with the Emerson Umbrella tenancy, noting that the only two negatives were the Emerson inability to afford to maintain the building and to find parking spaces.
 - iv) The location of the Highland in the Master Plan makes incorporating Highland into the new building program difficult but not insurmountable.
 - v) The preferred use of the Highland, if part of the CPS would be administrative, not student use.
 - vi) She is concerned with non-CPS during hours when student are on campus. She has few concerns regarding use of the Highland during non-student hours (typically evening) for other-than-CPS use.
 - vii) She was receptive to adaptive re-use for teacher apartments, 40B use for young teacher occupancy and elderly housing, believing all would make good neighbors.
 - viii) We had several informal conversations with the Congregational Church about the possibility of accommodating 30 +/- parking spaces on the church lot (teachers or potential users of Highland). The Church is more than willing to consider an explicit agreement with the town regarding access to parking. They want to be a “good neighbor.” However, members of the CSC are not

¹⁰ See Exhibit J.

¹¹ See Exhibit G.

sure costs of such a contract would be economical. We feel the parking issue should be explored more thoroughly as a new Highland Building Committee is charged to prioritize uses.

- i) After several meetings and as a result of our preliminary discussions, interviews and investigations, the Highland Building Study Group developed a preliminary list of possible dispositions of the Highland Building (regardless of user group). The possible dispositions, consistent with the Selectmen's original charge, were:
 - i) Demolish.
 - ii) Stabilize.
 - iii) Renovate on the existing site.
 - iv) Move to a new site and stabilize.
- j) The Highland Building Study Group concluded that the original list of possible user groups was to split into two sub-categories:
 - i) **Occupants who would be under the jurisdiction of Town government** - Carlisle Public School use, Carlisle Public School and Town joint use and exclusively Town, non-Carlisle Public School use.
 - ii) **Ownership/occupants that would NOT be controlled by Town government** - Private use, whether non-profit, private corporation, private residence or institutional use.
- k) This list of Possible Dispositions was expanded into the matrix in Exhibit H wherein we further expanded Possible Disposition and Possible User Groups. This resulted in 128 possible "options" to be investigated.
- l) The Highland Building Study Group then condensed the 128 Possible Dispositions/User Groups to six "most likely" options.¹² Each of these six options were developed into "Concept" (a brief explanation of the idea) and "Pros/Cons" of the Option. The six Possible Disposition Options selected are:
 - i) Option 1: Do nothing on the existing site.
 - ii) Option 2: Sell the building to a private party to remain on the existing site.
 - iii) Option 3: Demolish the Highland Building.
 - iv) Option 4: Leave the building on the existing site and stabilize the exterior to "buy time".
 - v) Option 5: Restore the Highland on the existing site to "pre-Umbrella" condition.
 - vi) Option 6: Full restoration on the existing site for many possible user groups.

3) Cost Study:

- a) Each of these six options were budgeted¹³. The costs were then incorporated into Exhibit H. Brief comments on the estimated costs:

¹² See Exhibit G.

¹³ See Exhibit F.

- i) The budget figures assume Prevailing Wages and a public bidding process to accomplish any construction work.
- ii) The figures do NOT attempt to incorporate any inflation, assuming that all decisions and comparisons are to be made based upon "today's dollars".
- iii) Figures include design and construction but do NOT include any furnishings or equipment.
- iv) As with all "conceptual estimating", the figures are based upon the estimator's vision of the scope of the work... the final result can differ substantially if the ultimate design decisions do not match that vision.
- v) Note that the "stabilization" scope does NOT include any fire protection, whereas "restore to pre-umbrella" does include fire protection.

Final Observations:

- 1) Any disposition of and possible use of the Highland Building, in its present location, must address, to the satisfaction of the Carlisle School Committee, the school administration and ultimately the Carlisle citizenry, the security and safety of the students on campus during the school day. The Highland Building Study Group reached this conclusion because of the frequently expressed concerns of the School Committee and School Superintendent regarding the potential high security risk private tenants could pose to the students and the burden these tenants would place on the parking, security and safety of the Carlisle Public School campus.
- 2) Although the Highland Building Study Group did not completely eliminate private building ownership and user groups in this study, we concluded that it was highly unlikely that anyone could convince the citizens of Carlisle that placing a tenant who is not under the jurisdiction of Town government was an acceptable possible use. However, we would recommend a more in depth study be performed by a more specifically qualified study group to research the possibility of using the Highland for private residences with restricted use (teachers, elderly, those with a vested interest in the Carlisle Public Schools).
- 3) Demolishing the Highland Building might alleviate some temporary operational problems and reduce some maintenance costs in the short term but it does not make sense in the long term (as supported by the Pro/Con discussion in Exhibit G). The Town needs the additional space.
- 4) If the Town agrees with our recommendation to “stabilize” the Highland while adaptive re-use options are being considered, we project that a separate committee would be formed to study the options. This committee would run concurrent to and coordinate its efforts with the Carlisle School Building Committee as they consider possible school uses of the Highland Building.
- 5) If our recommendation is followed, the use of the Highland Building will evolve over time. Initially, the Highland would be preserved. In the short run, use of the Highland may alleviate some school (and/or Town) space problems. During any future construction on campus (if and when approved) the Highland could become useful in creating safe space for further school use. In the longer run, the Highland is well placed to be apart from the evolving campus and could be considered for other municipal uses.

List of Exhibits:

- A. Selectmen's Charge to the Highland Building Study Group.
- B. Plans of the Highland Building.
- C. HMFH November 30, 2005 "Ideal" Program for 800, PreK-Eighth Grade Students.
- D. "Highland Building 1908-2008" as prepared by Dave Flannery.
- E. John Ballantine 1990 Opinion Poll.
- F. Highland School Cost Study.
- G. Concepts/Pros/Cons.
- H. Decision Matrix.
- I. Moving the Highland.
- J. Marie Doyle's responses to HBSG questions.
- K. Summary of HMFH's Highland Comments.

**Carlisle Board of Selectmen
Highland Building
November 13, 2007**

Objective: In response to a request from the Carlisle School Committee, on October 23, the Carlisle Board of Selectmen voted to establish an ad hoc committee to study and report back on the possible uses and ultimate disposition of the Highland Building on the Carlisle Public School Campus.

History: The Highland School was built in 1908 as the first consolidated school in the town of Carlisle. From Sidney Bull's History of the Town of Carlisle: *"the existing school buildings did not have the two hundred and fifty cubic feet of air space for each pupil that the State law requires, that it was impossible with stoves to maintain an even temperature in the rooms and corridors of seventy degrees, as required by law, and to have proper ventilation."* Also: *"The cost, including plans and supervision by the architect was \$8325. The schoolhouse is located on "Schoolhouse Hill" near the site of former schoolhouses that had served the Center district, and it was erected with a great degree of celerity, it being ready for use, and occupied, for school purposes for the first time during the week preceding Christmas in the year 1908 or, in other words, during the same year that the committee in charge were given the authority to build."* The Highland Building served as an integral part of the school campus until 1994, when the school committee determined it was no longer suitable for classroom purposes. Following the Annual Town meeting in 1997, when articles to refurbish the building and to demolish it were both defeated, the School Committee looked for an opportunity to lease the building to an outside organization. From 1994 until 2007, the Highland Building was leased to Emerson Umbrella and used by local artists for studios. As of July of 2007 the lease between the Carlisle School Committee and Emerson Umbrella was not renewed and the Highland Building is slated to remain unoccupied in a deteriorating state.

Name of Committee: The Highland Building Study Group

Purpose: To conduct a thorough study of all possible dispositions of the Highland Building including, but not limited to: on site preservation, moving, sale to other party, and demolition; and to research all possible user groups including, but not limited to the: the Carlisle Public School, other town departments, private associations, non-profits, and institutional organizations. This study shall include as much detail as possible on the feasibility of any and all options including: costs, practicality of renovation/building move, historical ramifications and sensibility to the school campus.

Committee Make-up: The committee will be appointed by the Board of Selectmen and will be comprised of seven members as follows: one representative each from the Board of Selectmen, the School Committee, the Planning Board, the Historical Commission; and three community at large representatives. The membership shall include at least three members who have professional expertise in one of the following areas: architecture/design, construction/contracting and/or historical preservation. Town boards

Start Jan 23? Wednesday

may designate a sitting member or may recommend an individual with appropriate experience to represent the interests of said board.

Time Frame / Schedule: The Highland Building Study Group shall be established and appointed by December th, 2007 and shall report back to the Board of Selectmen by June 30, 2008.

Deliverables: Comprehensive report of the feasibility of all possible uses and dispositions of the Highland Building. Each option shall include outline budget analysis and a full consideration of both short and long term implications.

"Ideal" Program for 800, PreK-Eighth Grade Students

	No.	Net sf.	Total net sf.	Notes
1. General Classrooms [28+4 sci.]				
First grade	4	855	3420	900-1000 sf = state allowable [-22/rm]
Second grade	4	855	3420	[-22/rm]
Third grade	4	855	3420	[-22/rm]
Fourth grade	4	855	3420	[-22/rm]
Fifth grade	3	855	2565	[-22/rm]
Sixth grade	3	855	2565	[-22/rm]
Seventh grade	3	855	2565	[-22/rm]
Eighth grade	3	855	2565	[-22/rm]
MS Project/Team Room	3	855	2565	
MS Project/Team Storage	3	200	600	
Subtotal			26505	
2. Kindergarten				
Classrooms	4	1200	4800	1200-1300 sf = state allowable [-20/rm]
Subtotal			4800	
3. Pre-School				
Classrooms	1	1200	1200	1200-1300 sf = state allowable [-15/rm]
Subtotal			1200	
4. Student Services/Special Education				
Learning Center (ES)	3	450	1350	ea.rm for 2 specialists serving 2 grades
Learning Center (MS)	2	600	1200	ea.rm for 2 specialists serving 2 grades
Small Group Room	4	165	660	
Testing	1	100	100	
Speech Room	1	350	350	
Reading Room	1	350	350	
OT	1	400	400	
PT	1	400	400	
PT Storage	1	150	150	
Director's Office	1	200	200	
Secretary's Office	1	150	150	
ELL Office	1	200	200	
Conference Room	1	250	250	
Subtotal			5760	
5. Music				
Music Classroom (ES)	1	1000	1000	1000-1200 sf = state allowable
Music Classroom (MS)	1	1400	1400	1400-1600 sf = state allowable
Band/Choral Room	0	0	0	on the Stage
Keyboard/Computer Lab	1	1000	1000	
Practice Room	4	75	300	75-130 sf = state allowable
Ensemble Room	3	250	750	up to 300 ES/ up to 200 MS
Instrument Storage	1	800	800	
General Storage	1	500	500	
Director's Office	1	200	200	
Subtotal			5950	
6. Art				
Classroom (ES)	1	1200	1200	1000-1200 sf = state allowable
Art Storage (ES)	1	250	250	
Classroom (MS)	1	1200	1200	1200-1400 sf = state allowable
Art Storage (MS)	1	250	250	
Subtotal			2900	

"Ideal" Program for 800, PreK-Eighth Grade Students

	No.	Net sf.	Total net sf.	Notes
7. Science				
Classroom	4	1200	4800	1000-1200 sf = state allowable
Technology/Engineering Center	1	2200	2200	100sf/student = state allowable
Prep Room	2	200	400	
Subtotal			7400	
8. Computer				
Lab	1	1000	1000	30sf/person = state allowable
Equipment Storage	1	300	300	
Tech Center Office	1	300	300	2 person office
Subtotal			1600	
9. Media Center/Library				
Library	1	3400	3400	1800sf-3000sf = state allowable (ES)
Story Area	1	400	400	
Office/ Workroom	1	360	360	
Subtotal			4160	
10. Case/Collaborative Program				
Classroom	1	855	855	
Subtotal			855	
11. Physical Education				
Gymnasium - 2-stations	1	7500	7500	
Fitness/Wellness Center	1	2000	2000	3rd teaching station/community use
Multi-Purpose Room	1	1800	1800	team mtgs, community use, etc.
Office	2	150	300	
Gym Storage	1	600	600	
Boys' Locker Room	1	900	900	
Girls' Locker Room	1	900	900	
Subtotal			14000	
Subtotal Basic Educational Spaces			75,130	
13. Dining Room				
Dining Room	1	3000	3000	4 seatings for 800 students
Subtotal			3000	15sf/student x 200, adjacent to multi-purpose room
14. Kitchen				
Kitchen	1	1800	1800	1300sf for 1st 300+1sf/ea addtl student
Subtotal			1800	incl.dishwash/storage/staff room
15. Auditorium				
Seating	1	4000	4000	1/2 the student population = 400
Stage	1	1800	1800	
Green Room/ Dressing Room	2	400	800	
Storage/ Workroom	1	855	855	
Subtotal			7455	
16. Nurse				
Office	1	250	250	for two
Exam Room	1	150	150	
Rest Area	1	175	175	
First Aid Room by Gymnasium	1	120	120	
Subtotal			695	

"Ideal" Program for 800, PreK-Eighth Grade Students

	No.	Net sf.	Total net sf.	Notes
17. Administration				
General Office	1	300	300	reception for 2/waiting/mail
Principal's Office	1	200	200	
Asst. Principal's Office	1	150	150	
File Storage	1	150	150	
Workroom	1	150	150	
Conference Room	1	250	250	
Subtotal			1200	
18. Student Services/Guidance				
Reception/Waiting	1	150	150	
Guidance Office	3	200	600	
File Storage	1	150	150	
Conference Room	1	250	250	
Subtotal			1000	
19. Teacher Areas				
Faculty Workroom/ Planning	3	250	750	ea.rm serving 3 grades (K-2,3-5,6-8)
Faculty Dining Room	1	1000	1000	
Subtotal			1750	
20. Storage/ Custodian				
Building Storage	1	550	550	ea.rm serving 3 grades (K-2,3-5,6-8)
Facilities Director's Office	1	150	150	
Custodial Workroom	1	300	300	
Outdoor/Maintenance Storage	1	800	800	
Academic Storage	3	350	1050	
Subtotal			2850	
Subtotal Misc. Educational Spaces			19,750	

Total Net Square Footage 94,880

Total Gross Square Footage (GSF= NSF x 1.5) 142,320

The Carlisle Opinion Survey

Table 60-1

Q13. What possible uses of the vacant Highland School building (on School Street) should Carlisle consider?

Summary Table - Most Important = 4 <-----> Not Important = 1

	Sex		Age			Income			
	Total	Male	Female	<49	50-64	65+	<\$59K	\$60K-\$99K	\$100K-\$140K+
a. Town offices	2.87	2.84	2.88	2.83	2.82	3.22	2.89	2.92	2.79
d. Community activities	2.49	2.39	2.58	2.54	2.36	2.62	2.47	2.55	2.41
e. Community center	2.39	2.27	2.50	2.43	2.29	2.63	2.43	2.40	2.38
c. Classrooms	2.00	1.93	2.08	2.03	1.82	2.18	2.09	1.92	2.09
b. Commercial space	1.78	1.72	1.81	1.78	1.70	2.00	1.83	1.84	1.68
f. Sell it	1.66	1.73	1.60	1.61	1.74	2.17	1.71	1.65	1.60
g. Destroy it	1.31	1.35	1.29	1.28	1.35	1.72	1.41	1.35	1.22

HIGHLAND SCHOOL COST STUDY			FINAL, 8/3/08		
Assumptions			Abbreviations:		
Current pricing, no inflation factors included			GSF, NSF, SF	=Gross, Net or just	Square feet
Includes Prevailing Wages, and a public bidding process			CY	=cubic yards	
Estimate format attempts to include design and construction			LS	=Lump sum	
Estimates do NOT include operating costs, or maintenance after construction					
Numbering coincides with "options" explained elsewhere in this report			QTY	Unit	Unit Price
1/2	These two options would have construction costs of "zero".				Total
3	Complete Building "takedown" demolition				
	HazMat	1 minor	5000		5000
	Takedown Demo	7224 GSF	10		72240
	Foundation removal	198 perim	50		9900
	fill hole	642 CY	15		9630
	subtotal				\$ 96,770
	total with general conditions, fees, permit, bond & contingency	20%			\$ 116,124
	design, construction administration, public bid process	15%			\$ 133,543
4	Exterior façade restoration/ stabilization for Mothball				
	This minimal mothballing scope does NOT include any improvement to alarm systems, and front porch reconstruction, any heating system upgrades/repairs or any fire protection system... it involves only "envelope" work to assure that the building suffers no further deterioration.				
	strip and reroof asphalt shingles	2800 sf	\$ 10		28000
	point and repair chimney (Berquist Proposal 8/7/07 plus 10%)	1 LS	\$ 18,150		18150
	repair/replace gutters & downspouts	180 LF	\$ 35		6300
	Repair windows, reputty, sash liners, replace broken glass	49 ea	\$ 500		24500
	Weatherstrip/repair exterior doors	6 ea	\$ 300		1800
	Check/repair foundation if needed	1 allow	\$ 2,000		2000
	Exterior cleanup and misc patchwork to avoid being an eyesore	1 allow	\$ 2,000		2000
	subtotal				\$ 82,750
	total with general conditions, fees, permit, bond & contingency	20%			\$ 99,300
	Total with design, construction administration, public bid process	15%			\$ 114,195
5	Level 1 & 2 Restoration... to Pre-Umbrella condition, occupiable for "non-accessible", non-public uses				
	This non public access ADA "waiver" is removed from the soon to be issued 7th edition of the building code so this option would have to be permitted soon.				
	From above, Level 1 renovations:				80750
	ADD Fire Protection:				
	Excavate, backfill for new system, cistern	1 LS	\$ 10,000		10000
	Cistern with piping to building	1 LS	\$ 25,000		45000
	Basic, exposed Sprinkler and standpipe system (for future enclosure)	6665 gsf	\$ 5.00		33323
	Fire Pump with pad and weatherproof enclosure	1 LS	\$ 55,000		55000
	Fire Alarm upgrade & tie in to sprinklers and Fire Dept.	6665 gsf	\$ 1.50		9997
	Further renovations:				
	Heating system repairs, reuse radiation with new efficient boiler	1 LS	\$ 12,500		12500
	Plumbing/bathroom renovations, cosmetic, reuse most	1 LS	\$ 10,000		10000
	Electrical upgrades	1 LS	\$ 10,000		10000
	Rebuild front porch and stairs	1 LS	\$ 20,000		20000
	Cosmetic touches, inside & out	1 LS	\$ 10,000		10000
	subtotal				\$ 296,570
	total with general conditions, fees, permit, bond & contingency	20%			\$ 355,884
	Total with design, construction administration, public bid process	15%			\$ 409,266
Continued on page 2					

HIGHLAND SCHOOL COST STUDY			FINAL, 8/3/08		
Assumptions					
6/7	Full rehab of the existing building plus construction of small rear addition				
	Addition would contain stair and elevator to make the building fully useable and accessible, for private business, town administrative or school use.				
	We have informally agreed that multi-tenant housing, assisted living, or retail use would burden the already sparse parking situation and be a significant security issue.				
			QTY	Unit	Unit Price
	From above, Level 1 & 2 renovations:				Total
	Completion of renovation, interior				\$ 296,570
	Interior removals for MEP upgrades, finish upgrades	7224	gsf	\$ 4	28896
	Remove radiation, install new HVAC system, add to above	7224	gsf	\$ 17	122808
	Gut and reconstruct toilet facilities, add to above	1	LS	\$ 35,000	35000
	Replace all electrical systems, add to above	7224	gsf	\$ 10	72240
	Interior millwork/stair restoration	1	LS	\$ 20,000	20000
	New flooring and base	5560	gsf	\$ 4	22240
	Interior Finishes: drywall & paint, all disturbed surfaces, & repair/overlay all, doors, etc.	5560	gsf	\$ 30	166804
	new basement topping slab	1811	nsf	\$ 8	14487
	Allowance for structural repairs, seismic	1	LS	\$ 25,000	25000
	Exterior façade improvements				
	Patch/repair/replace exterior wood trim & paint	2505	LF	\$ 12	30055
	Strip exterior wall siding, replace with cementitious siding & paint	3694	nsf	\$ 12	44323
	Replace exterior doors	7	leaves	\$ 1,000	7000
	Refurbish or replace windows	1058	sf	\$ 50	52921
	credit for window repairs above	-49	ea	\$ 500	-24500
	Addition for elevator and stair,,, 18x28				
	Foundation	92	LF	\$ 150	13800
	CMU bearing,shaft and exterior walls	4608	sf CMU	\$ 20	92160
	Metal joists and deck with concrete slabs	1008	SF	\$ 15	15120
	Slab on grade, with prep	504	SF	\$ 8	4032
	Exterior façade, cementitious clapboards,trim to match	1536	nsf	\$ 10	15360
	Exterior trim to match	1042	LF	\$ 10	10416
	Entry storefront/ vestibule, and upper floor openings	288	SF	\$ 50	14400
	Stair, extend to new roof	3	fl	\$ 6,500	19500
	New membrane roof, insulated	504	sf	\$ 12	6048
	Elevator	3	stop	\$ 27,000	81000
	Extend HVAC	1512	GSF	\$ 15	22680
	Extend electrical/ Fire alarm	1512	GSF	\$ 8	12096
	Extend fire protection	1512	GSF	\$ 4	6048
	Interior finishes (walls, floors, ceilings, doors, paint)	783	netsf	\$ 25	19575
	Site Improvements	1	LS	\$ 50,000	50000
	subtotal				\$ 1,296,079
	total with general conditions, fees, permit, bond & contingency	20%			\$ 1,555,295
	Total with design, construction administration, public bid process	15%			\$ 1,788,589
Note: This estimate EXCLUDES any special systems, furnishings or equipment required to fit up the space for school use.					
8	Connect to Robbins to create accessibility and school use ease				
	We determined this was not worth pricing because it is less viable than #6 or #7				
9	Building relocation... to precede either option 4, 5 or 7.				
	New foundation	198	LF	200	39600
	Site prep (clear, grade, etc.)	1	LS	10000	10000
	New site utilities.. Water line, fire main, electric, gas	1	allow	25000	25000
	Chimney demo	1	LS	20000	20000
	Reframe due to chimney removal	4	levels	2500	10000
	Fake chimney above roof line	1	LS	2000	2000
	Building Move, including allowance for damage repair en route	1	LS	135000	135000
	subtotal				241600
	total with general conditions, fees, permit, bond & contingency	20%			\$ 289,920
	Total with design, construction administration, public bid process	15%			\$ 333,408

EXHIBIT "G"

8/8/2008

The Highland Building Study Group Selective Possible Dispositions of the Highland Building. Concept, Pros and Cons

1. Do nothing.

A. Concept:

1. Defer all action on the building until some later date.

B. Pros:

1. This is the "do-nothing option." It simply defers decision but is, in any case, preferable to # 1 above (Demolition) and # 2 above (Selling) because the question can be reconsidered at a later time.
2. Least cost to the Town in the short term.
3. Allows the Town to postpone any major decision on the Highland until there is a better economic climate.
4. Allows the School Master Plan to proceed over the next year with "saving" the Highland Building as a option. Architecture and Planning professionals will analyze if the Highland building can be efficiently and economically incorporated into the Master Campus Plan.
5. Preserves a public historic building in Carlisle.

C. Cons:

1. This alternative is not without maintenance costs. Do nothing costs would involve better security systems, boarding up, daily checking of conditions, minor repairs to public access areas on the exterior and roof maintenance including fixing chimney flashing and maintenance. In lieu of shutdown, it may be prudent to continue heating the building until a final disposition of the building is determined.
2. The building would continue to deteriorate from non-use, adding to eventual total cost of restoration, were it to be undertaken later.
3. If the Town postpones the decision on the Highland it will continue to deteriorate.

2. Sell the building to a private party - single family residential use, private developer for multi-family residential use or private businesses) use, non-profit or institutional organization use.

A. Concept:

1. Using private sale, this option would remove the Building from Town ownership. Deed restrictions/conditions would restrict its private use.

B. On the existing site.

1. Pros:

- a. The building is preserved/restored using private funds while the Town retains the benefit of its visual appeal and historic significance.
- b. Expansion of the Town's private tax-paying residence/business base.

2. Cons:

- a. Loss of valuable acreage from the CPS campus.
- b. Selling the building to another party for moving would involve the disadvantages noted in Option #7 and, in addition, would involve loss of controls in relation to preservation and use.
- c. Sale to a private party would involve legal issues and costs to draft a private sale agreement that would control the use of the building and the attached land.
- d. At some level, the Town (and significantly the School Committee) loses control of the property with numerous consequences.

C. After moving the building to a new site.

1. See General Moving Option below for this option performed on the building AFTER it has been moved to a new site.

3. Demolish the building.

A. Concept:

1. Demolish the building and turn the space over to be used as parking, recreation, etc.

B. Pros:

1. Removes the fire and security issues concerning the school committee.
2. Allows new use of the existing building footprint within the CPS campus.
3. Eliminates operational and maintenance costs.
4. This is the most irreversible decision. Gone is gone.

C. Cons:

1. The Town forever loses the VALUE of the present building. The existing foundation and structure has a value that would vanish should the building be demolished.
2. Previous Town wide surveys were against Highland demolition, opting instead for preservation and re-use as a Town facility.
3. The Town forever loses a historic landmark. This building is important and is in fact a likely candidate for inclusion in the National Register.
4. Demolition has a cost (demolition and restoration of the old footprint).
5. "Bad example" would result from such action not only to the public at large but especially to students. (The Town should be a positive influence in these areas.)
6. Any positive benefits of the degrees of preservation that may be developed or as noted below are lost.
7. Not "green".

4. Exterior Façade Restoration/Stabilization.

A. Concept:

1. Stabilizing the building's exterior until a later date. Spend a minimal amount of money to repair areas that, if left as is, would cause significant structural or cosmetic damage to the building as a result of weather intrusion. Examples: repair windows, chimney flashing, front steps, siding repairs, restore/repaint exterior trims, boiler and heating pipe maintenance.
2. Make the building safe and weather tight but not occupyable (mothballed). Maintain as a "cold shell" with an intrusion alarm, maintain at 50 deg, drain all water and winterize all systems. Scope of work for "safe and weathertight" to be determined.

B. On the existing site.

1. Pros:

- a. Requires a low cost commitment to preserve the building for future use.
- b. Saves the historic structure.
- c. Preserves the buildings value for future use.

2. Cons:

- a. An "exterior stabilization" vote would indicate a strong sentiment to preserve the building for future use. As a result, it would be prudent to install, at some expense, a fire protection system to address the schools Highland Building "fire danger" concern.
- b. Traffic and parking in the area will not be improved.
- c. Yearly maintenance costs.
- d. "Mothballing" would have the most negative visual effect on the campus, neighbors, and the adjacent Historic District. This would be a negative for the entire Town because the school complex and especially its oldest buildings (Brick school and Highland) are generally and historically considered important components of the village itself.
- e. In addition to the above negative factors, if the building is slated for demolition after any substantial period of mothballing, all costs involved in the process would have been wasted.
- f. The fire danger concern would still exist.

C. After moving the building to a new site.

1. See General Moving Option below for this option performed on the building AFTER it has been moved to a new site.

5. Restoration to a pre-Umbrella condition, including exterior stabilization/weatherization - i.e. occupyable with fire protection.

A. Concept:

1. The building would be safe, code compliant, weathertight but not ADA compliant. The Town would then have the option to:
 - a. Rent the building to a private association, non-profit or institutional organization who would not require ADA accessibility (similar to Umbrella).
 - b. Do not occupy the building. Maintain minimal building requirements.

B. On the existing site.

1. Pros:

- a. This recommended course provides a great deal of flexibility without requiring the intrusion of a relatively large and iconic building onto a site for which it was not designed, and without other attendant losses, e.g., of tree removal necessary for moving the structure.
- b. It could potentially provide for more functional on campus use relating to some Town/School uses than do current or proposed buildings, e.g., music lessons, art classes/gallery and attendant educational functions, meeting room(s) away from regular classrooms, as well as some excellent storage and administrative space.
- c. The preservation and historic aspects of this recommendation would make the project more appealing and useful to all age groups and would be advantageous in several other ways as well. These include appeal to donors and possibly to grant providers, and becoming an ideal candidate for funding through CPC grants.
- d. This recommendation could be a unifying development in the Town.
- e. Removes the fire and security issues associated with alternate occupied use.
- f. Saves the historic structure.
- g. Preserves the building's value for future use.
- h. Requires a low cost commitment to preserve the building for future use.

2. Cons:

- a. Would require a facility management team to address tenant needs and enforce lease agreements.
- b. Traffic and parking in the area will not be improved.
- c. At some level, the Town (and significantly the School Committee) loses control of the property with numerous consequences.

C. After moving the building to a new site.

1. See General Moving Option below for this option performed on the building AFTER it has been moved to a new site.

6. Full rehab - major renovation/restoration to full code compliance and multi-use accessibility by adding an egress stair and elevator shaft exterior to the building, maintaining independence from the school.

A. Concept:

1. Upgrade/install new MEPP systems, restore/upgrade interior and exterior components. Achieve ADA and full code compliance.
2. Results in a building that is useable by any public or private association, non-profit or institutional organization (no link to the school).
3. Possible Carlisle Public School uses:
 - a. Administrative space (1200 sf).
 - b. Teacher's lounge and offices (1750 sf).
 - c. Student services administrative offices (800 sf).
 - d. Storage.
4. Possible Town of Carlisle uses:
 - a. Relocate selective town offices to the space.
 - b. Offer town organizations needing space an opportunity to occupy space in the building.
 - c. Possible Youth Center, Adult Education.
5. Building use could change depending on the hours of the day, i.e. CPS use in the day, Town use in the evening.
6. Possible public or private association, non-profit or institutional organization uses to be determined and as allowed for security purposes.

B. On the existing site.

1. Pros:

- a. This recommended course provides a great deal of flexibility without requiring the intrusion of a relatively large and iconic building onto a site for which it was not designed, and without other attendant losses, e.g., of tree removal necessary for moving the structure.
- b. It could potentially provide for more functional on campus use relating to some Town/School uses than do current or proposed buildings, e.g., music lessons, art classes/gallery and attendant educational functions, meeting room(s) away from regular classrooms, as well as some excellent storage and administrative space.
- c. The preservation and historic aspects of this recommendation would make the project more appealing and useful to all age groups and would be advantageous in several other ways as well. These include appeal to donors and possibly to grant providers, and becoming an ideal candidate for funding through CPC grants.
- d. This recommendation could be a unifying development in the Town.
- e. This is "green" building.

2. Cons:

- a. Could allow non-CPS use on the CPS campus.
- b. Traffic and parking in the area will not be improved.
- c. Cost.

C. After moving the building to a new site.

- 1. See General Moving Option below for this option performed on the building AFTER it has been moved to a new site.

7. **Move the building to town land and rehab the building for town or other use.**

A. Concept:

- 1. If the building cannot be utilized by the CPS and is a security hazard in its present location, the town could use it or rent it out in a new location. The most convenient and easier move location is this corner.

B. Move to a new site.

1. Pros:

- a. Preserves the historic building closer to (or in) the historic district.
- b. Removes the fire and security issues concerning the school committee.
- c. Opens up space at its old location for school related parking.
- d. Situates the Highland Building where suitable parking can be created.
- e. After moving and upgrade, the building could be rented out and or used for town purposes and can be available for future town requirements.
- f. Most of the building would be saved. The ground level (or foundation) would be lost.
- g. It is unlikely that a better site could be found.

2. Cons:

- a. The building loses its excellent, stable current foundation.
- b. Moving costs and the cost of a new foundation and site development.
- c. Damage to adjacent areas to facilitate the move.
- d. "Schoolhouse Hill," as the present location is called, is an important part of the Highland's and the Town's historic context and interest.
- e. Examination of the lower level has impressed the Committee with its easy ground entry access, construction, condition, and elements of architectural interest inside and out including, for example, the large and original
- f. It seems probable that any improvements made in moving could likewise be made on the current site without any of the disadvantages.
- g. Significant cost.
- h. Current by-laws on setback and parking might make this problematic.

EXHIBIT "H"

8/6/2008

The Highland Building Study Group

Decision Matrix - Possible Dispositions and User Groups

Possible Disposition	Possible User Group:	Option from Exhibit "G"	Move Cost	Base Cost	Total Cost	CPS	CPS/Town	Town	Priv	Nothing	Unocc	CPS use	Town	CPS/Town	Housing	Business	Other
1. Demolish	a. None	3		\$154,100	\$154,100	10	6	32	15	3	17	3	12	6	10	5	9
2. Stay Put on the Existing CPS Campus Site	a. CPS use - under the "control" of the Carlisle School Committee																
1. Do Nothing	a. None	1		\$40,000	\$40,000												
2. Exterior stabilization	a. Unoccupied	4		\$140,000	\$140,000	1				1							
3. Renovated for:	a. CPS exclusive use	6		\$1,771,000	\$1,771,000	1					1						
b. CPS/Town joint use - under a joint use agreement																	
1. Renovated for:	a. CPS/Town use	6		\$1,771,000	\$1,771,000		1							1			
1. CPS use during the school day																	
2. Town use during non school hours																	
c. Town, non CPS use - under the control of the Town																	
1. Do Nothing	a. None	1		\$40,000	\$40,000	1				1							
2. Exterior stabilization	a. Unoccupied	4		\$140,000	\$140,000			1			1						
3. Minor restoration	a. Limited occupancy (aim. To Emerson Umbrella)	5		\$531,700	\$531,700			1			1						
4. Renovated for:																	
a. TBD private tenant		6		\$1,771,000	\$1,771,000		1									1	
b. Affordable housing		6		see abv	see abv		1								1		
c. Town offices		6		see abv	see abv		1										
d. Recreation		6		see abv	see abv		1										
e. Town center		6		see abv	see abv		1										
d. Sold for private use																	
1. Renovated for:																	
a. Non-profits		3			Unknown				1								1
b. Affordable housing		3			Unknown			1							1		
c. Private business		3			Unknown			1								1	
d. Institutional organizations		3			Unknown			1									1
e. Private residence		3			Unknown			1							1		
3. Moved																	
a. By Carlisle																	
1. Off CPS campus to another Town property																	
a. Do nothing		1	\$502,000	\$40,000	\$542,000			1			1						
b. Exterior stabilization		4	\$502,000	\$140,000	\$642,000			1									
c. Renovated for:		6	\$502,000	\$1,771,000	\$2,273,000			1			1						
1. Unoccupied																	
1. Unoccupied																	
1. TBD private tenant					see abv			1								1	
2. Affordable housing					see abv			1							1		
3. Town offices					see abv			1									
4. Recreation					see abv			1									
5. Town center					see abv			1									1
d. Sold, as a parcel, to a private group																	
2. On CPS campus																	
a. Short move																	
1. CPS use																	
a. Do nothing		1	\$462,000	\$40,000	\$502,000												
b. Exterior stabilization		4	\$462,000	\$140,000	\$602,000						1						
c. Renovated for:		6	\$462,000	\$1,771,000	\$2,233,000												
1. CPS exclusive use												1					
2. CPS/Town jurisdiction																	

EXHIBIT "H"

8/6/2008

The Highland Building Study Group

Decision Matrix - Possible Dispositions and User Groups

Possible Disposition	Possible User Group:	Option from Exhibit "G"	Move Cost	Base Cost	Total Cost	CPS	CPS/Town	Town	Priv	Nothing	Unocc	CPS use	Town	CPS/Town	Housing	Business	Other
a. Do nothing	1. Unoccupied	1	\$462,000	\$40,000	\$502,000												
b. Exterior stabilization	1. Unoccupied	4	\$462,000	\$140,000	\$602,000		1				1						
c. Renovated for:	1. CPS use during the school day	6	\$462,000	\$1,771,000	\$2,233,000			1						1			
	2. Town use during non school hours							1						1			
3. Town, non CPS use																	
a. Do nothing	1. Unoccupied	1	\$462,000	\$40,000	\$502,000			1			1						
b. Exterior stabilization	1. Unoccupied	4	\$462,000	\$140,000	\$602,000			1									
c. Renovated for:	a. TBD private tenant	6	\$462,000	\$1,771,000	\$2,233,000			1									1
	b. Affordable housing				see abv			1							1		
	c. Town offices				see abv			1					1				
	d. Recreation				see abv			1					1				
	e. Town center				see abv			1					1				
b. Long move																	
1. CPS use																	
a. Do nothing	1. Unoccupied	1	\$502,000	\$40,000	\$542,000	1					1						
b. Exterior stabilization	2. Unoccupied	4	\$502,000	\$140,000	\$642,000	1											
c. Renovated for:	3. CPS exclusive use	6	\$502,000	\$1,771,000	\$2,273,000	1						1					
2. CPS/Town jurisdiction																	
a. Do nothing	1. Unoccupied	1	\$502,000	\$40,000	\$542,000												
b. Exterior stabilization	1. Unoccupied	4	\$502,000	\$140,000	\$642,000		1										
c. Renovated for:	1. CPS use during the school day	6	\$502,000	\$1,771,000	\$2,273,000			1						1			
	2. Town use during non school hours							1						1			
3. Town, non CPS use																	
a. Do nothing	1. Unoccupied	1	\$502,000	\$40,000	\$542,000			1									
b. Exterior stabilization	1. Unoccupied	4	\$502,000	\$140,000	\$642,000			1									
c. Renovated for:	1. TBD private tenant	6	\$502,000	\$1,771,000	\$2,273,000			1									1
	2. Affordable housing				see abv			1							1		
	3. Town offices				see abv			1					1				
	4. Recreation				see abv			1					1				
	5. Town center				see abv			1					1				
b. By private																	
1. For private use																	
a. To private property																	
1. Renovated for:	1. Affordable housing	3			Unknown										1		
	2. Private business				Unknown				1							1	
	3. Private residence				Unknown				1								1
	4. Institutional organizations				Unknown				1								1
	5. Non-profits				Unknown				1								1
b. To Carlisle property																	
1. Renovated for:	1. Affordable housing	3			Unknown												
	2. Private business				Unknown				1						1		
	3. Institutional organizations				Unknown				1							1	

EXHIBIT "H"

8/6/2008

The Highland Building Study Group

Decision Matrix - Possible Dispositions and User Groups

Possible Disposition	Possible User Group:	Option from Exhibit "G"	Move Cost	Base Cost	Total Cost	CPS	CPS/Town	Town	Priv	Nothing	Unocc	CPS use	Town	CPS/Town	Housing	Business	Other
						10	6	32	15	3	17	3	12	6	10	5	9
	4. Non-profits				Unknown				1								1
	5. THD private tenant				Unknown				1								1

Bob Stone

From: Bill Fink [bill995@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2008 12:41 PM
To: Bob Stone
Cc: Alan Carpenito; Chad Koski; Marie Doyle
Subject: Highland Committee responses from Carlisle School Superintendent
Attachments: Highland Committee responses 6_26_08[1].doc

Bob,

I have attached the document containing responses to your questions from Marie Doyle, Carlisle School Superintendent. I'll give you a call to discuss any questions you may have. Also, please feel free to contact me as needed. My home number is (978) 369 - 3827 and my cell is (303) 884 - 5379.

Thanks again for sending me the other comments you are considering for the report to the Selectmen. I will forward some recommended changes to those comments later today.

Bill

7/2/2008

Dear Highland Committee:

Thank you for asking for our input as you make recommendations for the future of the Highland Building. I have put my answers in blue, hopefully making it easier for you to find my responses.

1. Do you have any comments regarding the current use and condition of the Highland Building and its impact to the current campus? *We are trying to understand how the presence of the Highland currently impacts your planning*

The Highland Building sits empty as it continues to deteriorate, and it is sad to see this building in such disrepair. According to the fire chief, the building presents a fire hazard, given that it is a wooden structure that does not have a sprinkler system. The fire chief has stated that its proximity to the Robbins Building creates an increased fire risk for other school buildings and the Congregational Church. Another concern that one might have is that a vacant building might attract teenagers who may find the building inviting, and this could result in vandalism.

2. What would be your concerns if the Highland Building's exterior was restored and the building remained vacant but secured (similar to the present security and maintenance program)? *We are trying to understand if any of your comments/concerns from Question #1 could be alleviated by improving the condition of the Highland.*

As a fan of historic buildings, I would love to see this building returned to its majestic state. However, as a superintendent responsible for overseeing a cost effective educational program and a safe learning environment, the empty Highland might present some challenges as mentioned previously – fire and vandalism. Next, who would incur the expenses for heating and maintaining the empty building? Finally, would a cistern be placed near the Highland to provide water in the event of a fire? These are my worries about maintaining an unoccupied building.

3. When the Highland Building was occupied by the Emerson Umbrella, did that use and tenant occupancy have any impact on the campus, campus policies, education, traffic patterns, restrictions, etc. that are Study Group should be aware of? *We are trying to understand how the presence of "tenants" impacted the campus*

The Emerson Umbrella and the school district had an excellent relationship, and we valued having artists on campus. We felt safe with artists on campus, as we knew the occupants, assuring safety for our students. The challenge was to keep the building in excellent repair as the artists could not afford to maintain the Highland Building. It was nice to have local citizens in and out of the building as they kept an eye on the school as well as the Highland Building. Parking was a challenge as we do not have enough space for school staff, and

the artists would sometimes mention that they found it difficult to find a parking space when school was in session.

4. Questions pertaining to suitability of a fully renovated Highland for CPS use:
 - a. As an education professional, what is your opinion regarding the suitability of the Highland Building as an educational facility if it is renovated to 2008 standards?

Specifically:

- *It's location on the school campus?*

The Highland is in a more remote location than would be desired. Our plan is to reduce the footprint of the school in order to improve security for students and faculty. The Highland is in close proximity to the street, and the main entrance faces the street. Traffic could be a concern as well as the potential for strangers to easily be present on campus. I would have serious safety concerns regarding students traveling to and from the rest of the campus unsupervised. Our goal is to minimize the traveling of students in order to provide better supervision and assure the safety of our students.

When we try to determine potential school functions to place in Highland, we need to consider the impact of the isolation from the rest of the school. For some functions the impact could be minor or may even have some benefit from the remoteness, while other functions could be negatively impacted. For example, we would not want to isolate teachers from one another. When this happened in the past due to an overcrowding situation, some teachers felt lonely and not part of the organization. As we highly value teamwork and an integrated curriculum, placing teachers in close proximity is a necessity. On the other hand, administration is clearly separate from teaching, and this would be a possible option if the school district were to use the Highland Building.

- *Accessing the building from the adjacent school buildings?*

Some of the same concerns mentioned earlier would apply. An option might be to place a connector between the buildings as this would help to mitigate our security concerns.

- *Its ability to absorb existing or future educational programming needs such as Student Services, Special Education, Art Classrooms, Case/Collaborative Program, Administration or Guidance?*

Education today calls for inclusive schools where teachers collaborate on curriculum and students with disabilities or unique needs are mainstreamed to the school as much as possible. This means that special needs children are integrated as much as possible into the school's daily life. Students benefit from being included in regular education. Therefore, as an educator I would recommend that ELL, CASE and Special Education classes remain located with regular education classes. The art rooms should be located as close to regular

education classrooms as possible to foster integration of the curriculum and keep the art teachers as part of our school community.

The Highland could be used as office space for the superintendent, business manager and special education director. While we prefer being in the main building, we would still be close enough to attend all events as well as meetings. It might be possible to use a portion of the basement for storage of the many file cabinets, boxes of records and old resumes that we are legally mandated to retain.

- *We are trying to understand if there are any education regulations, agreements, perceptions or strategies that would prevent the Highland from being occupied for CPS use.*

I am not aware of any regulations that would prevent the school from using the Highland Building. However, the MSBA has provided guidelines that state a core classroom should be 950 square feet. Also, the HMFH report indicated that the Highland was no longer suitable for school use.

Should the Town fund the restoration of the Highland, the School Committee and Building Committee would need to consider possible uses for the Highland. Again, I would suggest that we use the space for offices and not for special education spaces as we do not want to isolate special needs students from regular education students. Also, we would not want to place students in the Highland as we want to keep students in a more central location to improve security and operating efficiencies.

- *Do you have any security concerns if the Highland was used for the CPS education program?*

I do have a few worries about the use of the Highland for classrooms. First, the building is remote from general campus activity. This would move us away from our goal of a centralized campus. The intent of that goal is to maximize security, reduce energy costs and improve the efficiency of moving students between classrooms and other school services. The building design limits its use for anything but offices and small group activity, in my opinion. Also, it would be best if the Highland Building were directly connected to Robbins for direct interior access.

- b. *Is there anything else that our Study Group should be aware of that would affect CPS use of a renovated Highland Building?*

I am not aware of any other issues.

5. Questions pertaining to suitability of Highland for non-CPS but Town use:

- a. If the Highland Building was renovated and used for non-CPS but Town programs, what would be your concerns if these programs occurred?

- *During the school day?*

For any program located on the school grounds, we would need the ability to monitor and CORI those who would be on the school campus. It would be possible, in my opinion, to include groups such as the Recreation Department, Adult Education and a Senior Citizen Center. We would know these people, all Carlisle's citizens, and they could complete a CORI.

The Highland Building is located quite close to the Robbins and Brick Building. Noise around school buildings is always an issue. For example, teachers have asked me to restrict the custodians from cutting the lawn when classes are underway as this distracts our little ones. Should the Highland be used for Town offices, then I would ask for assurances that whatever was housed in Highland respected our quiet zone when school is in session.

- *After the school day?*

We do have students on campus through the afternoon and into the evening, for after school activities such as sports and music, so the above security concerns would still apply.

- *In the evening?*

We have fewer concerns about holding evening activities in the Highland Building as our evening classes are held in the auditorium, so it would be possible to use the space. Activities such as Adult Education or the Recreation Department would work well.

- *We are trying to understand how the school day and campus plan would be affected by Town sponsored public activity in the Highland Bldg during various hours of the day.*

6. Questions pertaining to suitability of Highland for non-CPS, non-Town use:

a. If the Highland Building was renovated and used for non CPS non Town use, what would be your concerns if:

- *It contained private residence(s)?*

It would be important to know that people living in the apartments abided by school rules. Creating teacher apartments for Carlisle School Districts' employees might work, as teachers would follow the school schedule and understand the school rules. They would already be counted in our parking; there would not be noise coming from their units during school hours, as they would be at school. In addition, they would know the children and keep a safe eye on the Highland as well as the school. This could have 40 B potential, as the younger teachers would be the most probable candidates to apply for residency. One other possibility could be senior citizen apartments, as I'm sure that they would be good neighbors. I would ask that possible residents

complete a CORI and be informed about our noise concerns. Most importantly, the operational cost of the Highland should not take away from the school budget.

- *It contained a private single tenant similar to the Emerson Umbrella?*

The Emerson Umbrella folks were great neighbors, and my opinion on future tenants would depend on who the potential residents may be.

- *It contained several private business tenants such as lawyer's offices, accountants, real estate brokers, etc?*

I do think it would be possible to include groups such as Recreation Department, Adult Education, a Senior Citizen Center, senior or teacher housing. However, I would not think that private offices would provide a safe haven for our students as strangers would come and go, having access to children on campus. This would also exacerbate the parking situation as this was an issue when the artists were in residence.

- *We are trying to understand how the school day and campus plan would be affected by privately sponsored public activity in the Highland Bldg during various hours of the day.*

Should the building be renovated, it would be nice to have it used for school or community use. Again, school security would remain a concern, as adults would be in close proximity to our students. Finally, parking is limited, so this would need to be addressed in order to make any proposal viable.

Thank you for taking time to listen to my input. I appreciate your thoughtfulness in assessing how the Highland Building could impact the educational program and the budget of our school system. If I can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Regards,
Marie Doyle
Superintendent

Highland Building comments extracted from the 2006 HMFH Master Plan report:

1. While Highland generated much discussion of its historic importance to the Town, the School Committee and SBC have deemed the building not viable for school use and the Highland is not included in the study options. Likewise, the SBC agreed that Brick is too isolated for educational space and is therefore not included in the master planning options. Further discussion of all three structures is included in this report.
2. The seventh building on the campus is the 1908, wood-framed Highland Building that currently is not used for school purposes.
3. Highland Building 6,900sf, built in 1908, renovated in the 1930's and 1970's.
4. Regarding roofing: Chimney flashing at Highland is actively leaking and allowing water to damage interior plaster ceilings.
5. Regarding foundations: The solid masonry walls and foundations of Brick and Highland require repointing and minor repair.
6. Regarding exteriors:
 - a. The wood shingle siding that covers the original clapboard siding at Highland is faded, worn, curling and loose. It should be removed. The condition of the clapboards underneath is unknown. It is recommended, in the interest of the historic nature of the Highland Building that the clapboards be restored or replaced in kind, depending upon the condition in which they are found to be.
 - b. Original wood windows at Brick and Highland are in decent condition. Storm windows are present at most, though not at all openings. The storm windows have improved the insulating quality and prolonged the life of the glazing putty and paint finish. Highland windows are in worse condition, particularly where storms are absent. Windows at Highland are reportedly not functioning, as they are painted shut. Renovation work should include complete refurbishing or replacement of the original wood windows at Brick and Highland.
 - c. Many of the painted surfaces including siding at Spalding, wood eaves and rakes at Spalding, soffits at Robbins, the ornamental wood throughout Highland and at various exterior doors and frames, are peeling or flaking. All painted surfaces should be covered with a new material or be repainted.
7. Regarding interiors:
 - a. Much of the built-in furnishings and equipment was installed in the 1987 or the 1997 renovations and construction. The exception is in Highland and Wilkins where much of the original furnishings remain. Any furnishings older than 1987 have reached its life expectancy and functionality and should be replaced.
 - b. Since most light fixtures were replaced a few years ago, or are from 1987 and 1997 construction, there is likely not a significant issue regarding mercury containing lamps and PCB containing ballasts. However, portions of the campus where lights had not been replaced should be investigated further for the presence of these items. This is suspected primarily within Spalding and Highland but all areas constructed prior to 1987 should be investigated.
 - c. The Massachusetts Architectural Access Board (MAAB) and the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) require that a renovation totaling 30% or more of the value of a building is the threshold for which an entire facility must be made to comply. There are many compliance issues at this facility; the following is a general overview and a few specific significant issues (refer to Appendix I for all of the conditions):
 - i. While much of the campus is at the consistent upper plaza level, Highland and Brick have floor levels that are higher than grade and as

such are not accessible. The existing ramp at Brick is in terrible condition and is non-compliant. Within Highland the three floor levels are not accessible.

8. Regarding structure:

- a. There is some specific corrective work that should be undertaken to prolong the life of buildings:
 - i. Masonry walls and foundations at Brick, Highland, and Spalding need repair and repointing in order to prevent further deterioration.
 - ii. The exterior fire escape at Highland appears to be structurally sound but the paint finish is wearing significantly and some rusting is beginning to show. This is cause for concern as to its long-term condition. It should be inspected and certified for safety as is required every five years by the Building Code.
 - iii. Depending upon the level of renovations undertaken, the Building Code requires structural upgrades to building lateral load resisting systems and reduction of earthquake hazards. For buildings on this campus, particularly for those constructed prior to 1987, these upgrades typically involve upgrading or adding adequate connections between floor and roof diaphragms to the vertical-plane structural elements and of unreinforced masonry walls to the primary structure.

9. Much discussion and analysis was centered on the potential future school use of Highland Building. Highland, built in 1908, is a three-level, wood-structure of just 6,900 gross square feet. The building is currently rented by artisans and is not used by the School. See Appendix L, Item 3 for diagrams of Highland with proposed future program uses. The possibilities discussed include a daycare center, offices for the school administration and a community use conference room. Highland is in need of a substantial amount of renovation work to meet current code requirements and safety standards, inclusive of new mechanical, electrical, lighting, plumbing and fire protections systems. The exterior is in need of a new roof, new exterior siding, new or complete refurbishing of windows, repairs to woodwork and the foundation, and rebuilding of the entry porch. The interior finishes are tired and in need of replacement and/or repair. The building is not accessible to the physically challenged and would require both an accessible route to enter the building and an accessible means to travel from floor to floor. Exclusive of circulation and support needs, a renovated Highland Building would contain approximately 3,750 square feet of net usable space. The cost to accomplish the renovation as outlined above would be substantially greater than that for the same amount of program space in new construction and/or renovation. The HMFH team estimates, on the basis of similar experience, that a fully accessible renovation of Highland would cost between \$1.5 million and \$2 million for construction only. Additionally, programming Highland for school use would perpetuate the already inefficient, sprawling campus conundrum. To this end the School Building Committee has voted that Highland is inappropriate for school use and is to be excluded from the master plan.

10. Regarding function: the loop at the Highland building is used for drop-off/pick-up of Pre-school (there is a fire lane/neighbor issue with this arrangement).

11. Regarding character and history (taken from Appendix 1):

- a. The next building on the campus was the Highland Building, a 3-story wood-framed classical styled structure with a grand entry porch and balcony and a classic pediment containing intricate carved wood scrollwork. The building's roof shape is hipped and is anchored by a large central brick chimney. The exterior walls are currently sheathed in worn, painted wood shingles covering the original clapboard siding. The walls have a large proportion of grand twelve-over-twelve wood double-hung windows. This building originally contained four classrooms and along with the Brick Building satisfied the town's

school needs for over 40 years. School programs moved out of Highland in 1988. The building remained empty for three years until it was leased out as artist studios.

- b. The Brick Building art classroom and the Highland Building have potential for being very pleasant spaces due to the character and large quantity of windows and their higher ceiling heights.
- c. Walls:
 - i. Material: Wood stud framed with exterior painted wood shingles installed over the original painted wood clapboards. Interior surface is plaster. There is evidence that at some point in time, there was blown-in insulation added between the studs. The wood trim, water table, pilasters, moldings, cornices, soffits and scrollwork are painted. Stone foundation (4'-0" in height) laid with wide mortar joints.
 - ii. Condition: The wood shingles are worn, curled and loose. The condition of the wood clapboards underneath is not known, though a small portion was observed (at the location of a loose shingle) and appeared to be sound, though the paint was worn. The wood trim, etc. is generally in very good condition, with a few areas of rotted wood at roof eaves and rakes. Some joints however, particularly at corner conditions have separated and opened up. The paint finish on most surfaces is worn and flaking off. The stone mortar joints have many locations of excessively dried and spalling areas. The interior surface plaster is in fair condition, though with stress cracks in some areas.
 - iii. Recommendation: The wood shingles should be removed. Once this is done, an assessment of the clapboards can be made. It is likely that some, if not all, of the clapboard would need replacement. The wood trim, etc. should be stripped and repainted. Some portions would need to be repaired/ replaced to correct areas of rot and open joints. The stone foundation wall should at a minimum be re-pointed at areas of loose or cracked mortar. It eventually should be completely re-pointed.
- d. Windows and Doors:
 - i. Material: Double-hung solid wood with true divided light, single pane glass. Presumed to be the original 1908 windows. Aluminum storm windows have been installed on the exterior over some of the windows. Two replacement vinyl slider windows are installed at the lower level. The front entry doors and one of the side entry doors are painted wood with raised panel and divided lights. They are assumed to be original. Other doors are solid painted wood of a more recent age.
 - ii. Condition: The wood windows are generally in good structural condition. Few, where storm windows are not present, appear to have rotted sashes and muntins. Common for windows of this age, the smooth operation of sashes, hardware and air infiltration prevention is compromised by wear and tear and overpainting. Reportedly many of the windows are painted shut and are unable to be opened. Glazing putty is dried up and cracking in some areas, particularly where storm windows are not present. The original wood doors are in good condition although the paint finish is worn. Other doors are worn and rotted in some areas.
 - iii. Recommendation: All of the windows should be refurbished completely, including re-glazing, repaired and/or new hardware and sash ropes, add weather-stripping and stripped and re-painted. The storm windows likely would be damaged during this work and therefore should be assumed to need to be replaced. An alternative would be to replace them with new wood or metal insulating glazed windows. Given the historic character of the Highland Building, any replacement windows should be a historic profile type with true-divided lights. The original wood doors should be repainted. The other doors should be replaced with new doors consistent with the character of the building.
- e. Porch and Balcony:
 - i. Material: Painted wood porch structure, decking, steps and rails with turned wood balusters.
 - ii. Condition: The structure is in fair condition. The decking and steps are in poor condition. The rails are in fair condition with some components rotted and loose. The paint finish is worn and flaking off.
 - iii. Recommendation: The decking and steps should be replaced. At this time the structure can be assessed and replaced if necessary. The rails should be

repaired and/or replaced in kind. The rails would need modification to increase their height to comply with current code requirements.

- f. Interior Partition and Finish Systems:
 - i. Partitions:
 - 1. Material: Highland: Plaster on wood stud framing (from the original construction.)
 - 2. Condition: Good condition- minor shrinkage cracks in Highland plaster. Paint finish is in good condition.
 - 3. Recommendation: Repair cracks in plaster.
 - ii. Floors:
 - 1. Material: Highland: Hardwood strip flooring (from the original construction.)
 - 2. Condition: Wood strip flooring in Highland is in good condition though the finish is worn. One area at the First Floor entry is damaged from a previous water spill.
 - 3. Recommendation: Refinish the wood flooring at Highland and remove and replaced the damaged area.
 - iii. Ceilings:
 - 1. Material: Plaster with painted finish.
 - 2. Condition: Good condition, some shrinkage cracking in Highland plaster, one water-damaged hole in Second Floor ceiling resulting from a recent roof leak.
 - 3. Recommendation: Repair plaster at Highland.
 - iv. Stairs (Highland only):
 - 1. Material: Wood framed stairs with hardwood treads and risers (from the original construction.) Center rail is contoured, wood handrails, with wood pickets and ornamental wood newel posts. Wall mounted handrail is painted steel.
 - 2. Condition: Good condition.
 - 3. Recommendation: Any renovation work within Highland would require modifications to the handrails in order to bring them into conformance with the Building and Accessibility codes regarding heights, grip size, and rail extensions.
- g. Only the fixtures at the Spalding and Highland Buildings should be replaced in any renovation work.
- h. The following items are indicated on the original drawings or otherwise suspect of containing asbestos:
 - i. Highland: -plaster ceilings.
 - ii. Reportedly, all exposed and accessible asbestos containing pipe insulation, as well as the boiler breeching has been removed. It is likely that asbestos containing pipe insulation remains buried within walls, behind built-in cabinets, or above inaccessible ceilings within Spalding, Wilkins and Robbins, and possibly Highland. Testing of any suspected materials should be performed prior to any future renovation or demolition work. Proper asbestos abatement procedures would need to be included for any materials that test positive and are affected by such future renovation or demolition work.
 - iii. Light fixtures can have florescent lamps, which contain mercury, and ballasts, which contain PCB.s. Since most fixtures have recently been replaced, it is likely that these conditions do not occur to any significant degree. However any space that contains original pre-1980 fixtures should be checked for these materials and if they are present, proper disposal would be required when any replacements occur. Lead-based paint could be present in areas constructed prior to 1978. Surfaces appeared intact and there were no observed signs of flaking or peeling paint in pre-1978 areas. Investigation and testing for lead-containing paint in such areas should be conducted prior to any renovation work that would affect these areas. Regulations apply for worker safety should such surfaces be disturbed or the material becomes airborne.
- i. The Highland Building may be considered for a return to school, administrative or town use. Any areas of the building that are open to the public and to students would need to comply with access requirements. Currently none of the floor levels are accessible.
- j. The steam system, currently serving the Highland Building has been upgraded, but continues to maintain some portions of the building.s original heating system. This

equipment has exceeded its anticipated life and should not be scheduled to remain after any significant renovation.

- k. The Highland building is equipped with a separate electrical service.
 - l. Each building on campus, (including the Highland building), is covered by the central/main FACP in the Wilkins building. A satellite FACP, or node exists at each building. The fire alarm system is in good condition, and appears to be well maintained.
12. Because the school has buildings oriented to both School Street and Church Street, there is no clear main entrance or front.. All students (except for those in the Collaborative/Case Program) and most visitors come to the parking lot off Church Street and make their way up the hill with the Corey Building dominating their view (Figure 2). It is this building that greets you at the top of the steps, but visitors looking for the schools administration offices must find them further back at the Wilkins Building. The four modern structures on the campus are visible from the central paved recreation space and help to define it, while the two older structures are disconnected and out of view on School Street. A visitor entering the campus from School Street must choose between two separate driveway loops (Spalding and Highland). From this vantage, it is the more modern campus buildings that seem to turn their backs (or sides) and once again, a main entrance. is not apparent (Figure 3).
13. The site has a variety of trees including some impressive examples. The great white oak in front of Highland on School Street is an enormous specimen that spreads its branches roughly 100 feet. (Figure 28) Other trees include callery pear, black locust, white pine, Scotch pine, red maple, sugar maple, oak, linden and crabapple, in addition to other species mentioned above. Many of these trees are mature and contribute greatly to defining the space around them and adding character to the campus.
14. The loop in front of Highland is used for pickup/drop-off for the pre-K classroom at the end of Robbins. Otherwise it remains somewhat empty, used as parking for the artist residents of Highland. Two of the four parking spaces on the south side of the loop are marked for handicap use (Figure 32).
15. Despite excellent maintenance performed at the facility many of the systems and finishes require upgrades to comply with current building and accessibility codes as well as to improve system efficiencies, energy efficiencies and durability of finishes. The oldest buildings on the campus (the 1848 Brick Building and the 1908 Highland Building) are worthy buildings of historic and architectural interest but both buildings are poorly situated relative to the majority of the school functions. These buildings, particularly Highland, would require various upgrades for code compliance.